

KJV NOTES

Wycliffe

(My note)- The Wycliffe Bible predates Erasmus Greek NT so he could not have had access to it, yet the Wycliffe Bible is in perfect harmony with Erasmus' Greek NT indicating that the then common received Greek text which was the basis for Erasmus NT was also the Greek text that Wycliffe referred to for his English Bible. He records in the preface that he translated from the vulgar Latin which were older Latin manuscripts in the vulgar or common tongue of the people. He did not use Jerome's Latin Vulgate which he believed to be flawed. KJV critics claim that Wycliffe used the Latin Vulgate which could not be possible since Wycliffe's translation does not agree with the corrupt Latin Vulgate and is in perfect harmony with the Textus Receptus and the KJV.

The original prologue to the Wycliffe Bible warns of corrupt Latin Bibles.

Wycliffe himself said that he had access to the Hebrew manuscripts: *The Jews were dispersed among the nations taking with them their Hebrew manuscripts. Now this happened that we might have recourse to their manuscripts as witnesses to the fact that there is no difference in the sense found in our Latin books and those Hebrew ones.* – Wycliffe pg. 788 In Awe of Thy Word.

Wycliffe also mentions correcting manuscripts according to the Greek exemplar.

He had access to the Greek received text which he used to compare and check the Latin versions which he translated from. In essence the Wycliffe Bible is a translation not only from the old vulgar Latin, but from the Hebrew Masoretic text and the Greek received text which he referred to during the translation process.

ITALICIZED WORDS

Do not be so quick to throw out the italicized words of the KJV. They often have support from the Greek manuscripts as well as the vernacular editions.

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." Ps 12:6-7

"The issue ultimately is: Has God preserved throughout history a continuous, uninterrupted text for the Church or has He merely preserved for one thousand years a corrupted text and then revealed His true text when a German critic at the convent of St. Catherine

picked out of a wastebasket one single manuscript?" (Donald Brake, reprinted from *Counterfeit or Genuine?* Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, p. 179).

"I am utterly disinclined to believe--so grossly improbable does it seem--that at the end of eighteen hundred years 995 copies out of every thousand, suppose, will prove untrustworthy; and that the one, two, three, four, or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have retained the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired" (Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p. 12).

And if the Bible which went to the ends of the earth during the greatest era of missionary activity in church history since the apostolic era was not the preserved Word of God, there is no such thing as the preserved Word of God, and this entire matter is merely an exercise in vanity.

History of:

This article was taken from the book *A Brief History of English Bible Translations* by Dr. Laurence M. Vance.

One of the first things done by the new king was the calling of the Hampton Court Conference in January of 1604 "for the hearing, and for the determining, things pretended to be amiss in the church." Here were assembled bishops, clergymen, and professors, along with four Puritan divines, to consider the complaints of the Puritans. Although Bible revision was not on the agenda, the Puritan president of Corpus Christi College, John Reynolds, "moved his Majesty, that there might be a new translation of the Bible, because those which were allowed in the reigns of Henry the eighth, and Edward the sixth, were corrupt and not answerable to the truth of the Original." The king rejoined that he:

"Could never yet see a Bible well translated in English; but I think that, of all, that of Geneva is the worst. I wish some special pains were taken for an uniform translation, which should be done by the best learned men in both Universities, then reviewed by the Bishops, presented to the Privy Council, lastly ratified by the Royal authority, to be read in the whole Church, and none other."

Accordingly, a resolution came forth:

"That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can

be to the original Hebrew and Greek; and this to be set out and printed, without any marginal notes, and only to be used in all churches of England in time of divine service."

The work began to take shape in 1604 and progressed steadily. The translators expressed their early thoughts in their preface as:

"Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one,...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against, that hath been our endeavor."

The next step was the actual selection of the men who were to perform the work. In July of 1604, James wrote to Bishop Bancroft that he had "appointed certain learned men, to the number of four and fifty, for the translating of the Bible." These men were the best biblical scholars and linguists of their day. In the preface to their completed work it is further stated that "there were many chosen, that were greater in other men's eyes than in their own, and that sought the truth rather than their own praise. Again, they came or were thought to come to the work, learned, not to learn." Other men were sought out, according to James, "so that our said intended translation may have the help and furtherance of all our principal learned men within this our kingdom."

Although fifty-four men were nominated, only forty-seven were known to have taken part in the work of translation. The translators were organized into six groups, and met respectively at Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford. Ten at Westminster were assigned Genesis through 2 Kings; seven had Romans through Jude. At Cambridge, eight worked on 1 Chronicles through Ecclesiastes, while seven others handled the Apocrypha. Oxford employed seven to translate Isaiah through Malachi; eight occupied themselves with the Gospels, Acts, and Revelation.

They had at their disposal all the previous English translations to which they did not disdain:

Four years were spent on the preliminary translation by the six groups. The translators were exacting and particular in their work, as related in their preface:

Neither did we disdain to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anvil that which we had hammered: but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at the length, through the

good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see.

The conferences of each of the six being ended, nine months were spent at Stationers' Hall in London for review and revision of the work by two men each from the Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford companies. The final revision was then completed by Myles Smith and Thomas Bilson, with a preface supplied by Smith.

The completed work was issued in 1611, the complete title page reading:

"THE HOLY BIBLE, Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Translations diligently compared and revised, by his Majesties Special Commandment. Appointed to be read in Churches. Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie. ANNO DOM. 1611."

The New Testament had a separate title page, the whole of it reading:

"THE NEWE Testament of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST. Newly Translated out of the Originall Greeke: and with the former Translations diligently compared and revised, by his Majesties speciall Commandment. IMPRINTED at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie. ANNO DOM. 1611. Cum Privilegio."

The King James Bible was, in its first editions, even larger than the Great Bible. It was printed in black letter with small italicized Roman type to represent those words not in the original languages.

TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE
JAMES,
BY THE GRACE OF GOD
KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND, DEFENDER OF

THE FAITH, &C.,/P

The Translators of the Bible wish Grace, Mercy and Peace, through
JESUS CHRIST, our Lord.

For when Your Highness had once out of deep judgment apprehended how convenient it was, that out of the Original Sacred Tongues, together with comparing of the labours, both in our own, and other foreign Languages, of many worthy men who went before us, there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures into the English Tongue; Your Majesty did never desist to urge and to excite those to whom it was commended, that the work might be hastened, and that the business might be expedited in so decent a manner, as a matter of such importance might justly require.

The ***Authorized King James Version*** is an [English](#) translation of the Christian [Holy Bible](#) begun in 1604 and completed in 1611 by the [Church of England](#).^[3]

This was the third such official translation into English; the first having been the [Great Bible](#) commissioned by the Church of England in the reign of King [Henry VIII](#), and the second having been the [Bishop's Bible](#) of 1568.^[6] In January 1604, [King James I of England](#) convened the [Hampton Court Conference](#) where a new English version was conceived in response to the perceived problems of the earlier translations as detected by the [Puritans](#),^[7] a faction within the Church of England.

In common with most other translations of the period, the [New Testament](#) was translated from the [Textus Receptus](#) (Received Text) series of the [Greek](#) texts. The [Old Testament](#) was translated from the [Masoretic Hebrew](#) text, while the [Apocrypha](#) were translated from the [Greek Septuagint](#) (LXX), except for [2 Esdras](#), which was translated from the Latin [Vulgate](#).

While the Authorized Version was meant to replace the [Bishops' Bible](#) as the official version for readings in the Church of England, it was apparently (unlike the *Great Bible*) never specifically "authorized", although it is commonly known as the *Authorized Version* in the United Kingdom. However, the King's Printer issued no further editions of the *Bishops' Bible*; so necessarily the *Authorized Version* supplanted it as the standard lectern Bible in parish church use in England. In the [Book of Common Prayer](#) (1662), the text of the *Authorized Version* replaced the text of the *Great Bible* — for Epistle and Gospel readings — and as such was "authorized" by Act of Parliament.^[11] In the [United States](#), the *Authorized Version* is known as the *King James Version*. The earliest appearance in print of the

phrase "authorized version", to mean this particular version of the Bible, was published in 1824.^[12] The phrase "King James version" first appeared in print in 1884.^[13]

The followers of [John Wycliffe](#) undertook the first complete English translations of the Christian scriptures in the 15th century. These translations were banned in 1409 due to their association with the [Lollards](#).^[14] The Wycliffe Bible pre-dated the printing press but was circulated very widely in manuscript form, often inscribed with a date earlier than 1409 to avoid the legal ban.

In 1525, [William Tyndale](#), an English contemporary of [Martin Luther](#), undertook [a translation](#) of the New Testament.^[15] Tyndale's translation was the first *printed* Bible in English. Over the next ten years, Tyndale revised his New Testament in the light of rapidly advancing biblical scholarship, and embarked on a translation of the Old Testament.

Tyndale's work and prose style made his translation the ultimate basis for all subsequent renditions into Early Modern English.^[17] With these translations lightly edited and adapted by [Myles Coverdale](#), in 1539, Tyndale's New Testament and his incomplete work on the Old Testament became the basis for the *Great Bible*. This was the first "authorized version" issued by the [Church of England](#) during the reign of King [Henry VIII](#).¹

When [Mary I](#) succeeded to the throne in 1553, she returned the Church of England to the communion of the Roman Catholic faith and many English religious reformers fled the country,^[18] some establishing an English-speaking colony at [Geneva](#). Under the leadership of [John Calvin](#), Geneva became the chief international centre of [Reformed Protestantism](#) and Latin biblical scholarship.^[19] These English [expatriates](#) undertook a translation that became known as the *Geneva Bible*.^[20] This translation, dated to 1560, was a revision of Tyndale's Bible and the *Great Bible* on the basis of the original languages

Soon after [Elizabeth I](#) took the throne in 1558, the flaws of both the *Great Bible* and the *Geneva Bible* (namely, that the Geneva Bible did not "conform to the ecclesiology and reflect the episcopal structure of the Church of England and its beliefs about an ordained clergy") became painfully apparent.^[22] In 1568, the Church of England responded with the *Bishops' Bible*, a revision of the *Great Bible* in the light of the Geneva version.^[23] While officially approved, this new version failed to displace the Geneva translation as the most popular English Bible of the age - in part because the full Bible was only printed in [lectern](#) editions of prodigious size and at a cost of several

pounds.^[24] Accordingly, Elizabethan lay people overwhelmingly read the Bible in the Geneva Version - small editions were available at a relatively low cost.

The newly crowned King James convened the [Hampton Court Conference](#) in 1604. That gathering proposed a new English version in response to the perceived problems of earlier translations as detected by the [Puritan](#) faction of the Church of England.

James' instructions included several requirements that kept the new translation familiar to its listeners and readers. The text of the [Bishops' Bible](#) would serve as the primary guide for the translators, and the familiar proper names of the biblical characters would all be retained. If the *Bishops' Bible* was deemed problematic in any situation, the translators were permitted to consult other translations from a pre-approved list: the [Tyndale Bible](#), the [Coverdale Bible](#), [Matthew's Bible](#), the [Great Bible](#), and the [Geneva Bible](#).

It is for this reason that the flyleaf of most printings of the *Authorized Version* observes that the text had been "translated out of the original tongues, and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by His Majesty's special command."

The task of translation was undertaken by 47 scholars, although 54 were originally approved.^[10] All were members of the Church of England and all except [Sir Henry Savile](#) were clergy.^[30] The scholars worked in six committees, two based in each of the [University of Oxford](#), the [University of Cambridge](#), and [Westminster](#). The committees included scholars with Puritan sympathies, as well as [High Churchmen](#). Forty unbound copies of the 1602 edition of the *Bishops' Bible* were specially printed so that the agreed changes of each committee could be recorded in the margins.^[31] The committees worked on certain parts separately and the drafts produced by each committee were then compared and revised for harmony with each other.¹

They all had completed their sections by 1608, the Apocrypha committee finishing first.^[34] From January 1609, a General Committee of Review met at [Stationers' Hall, London](#) to review the completed marked texts from each of the six committees. The General Committee included [John Bois](#), [Andrew Downes](#) and [John Harmer](#), and others known only by their initials, including "AL" (who may be [Arthur Lake](#)), and were paid for their attendance by the Stationers' Company. John Bois prepared a note of their deliberations (in Latin) - which has partly survived in two later transcripts.^[35] Also surviving is a bound-together set of marked-up corrections to one of the forty *Bishops'*

Bibles - covering the Old Testament and Gospels,^[36] and also a manuscript translation of the text of the [Epistles](#), excepting those verses where no change was being recommended to the readings in the *Bishops' Bible*.^[37] Archbishop [Bancroft](#) insisted on having a final say, making fourteen changes, of which one was the term "bishopricke" at Acts 1:20.^[38]

[Archbishop Richard Bancroft](#) was the "chief overseer" of the production of the Authorized Version.

Authorized Version

While the *Authorized Version* was meant to replace the *Bishops' Bible* as the official version for readings in the [Church of England](#), it was apparently (unlike the *Great Bible*) never specifically "authorized", although it is commonly known as the *Authorized Version* in the [United Kingdom](#). However, the King's Printer issued no further editions of the *Bishops' Bible*, so necessarily the *Authorized Version* supplanted it as the standard lectern Bible in parish church use in England. In the 1662 *Book Of Common Prayer*, the text of the *Authorized Version* finally supplanted that of the *Great Bible* in the Epistle and Gospel readings - though the Prayer Book [Psalter](#) nevertheless continues to use the older version.

The original printing contained two prefatory texts; the first was a rather fulsome [Epistle Dedicatory](#) to "the most high and mighty Prince" King James. Many British printings reproduce this, while a few cheaper or smaller American printings fail to include it.

The second, and more interesting^[citation needed] preface was called *The Translators to the Reader*, a long and learned essay that defends the undertaking of the new version. It observes that the translators' goal was not to make a bad translation good, but a good translation better, and says that "we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession... containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God".^[77] Few current editions include this text, but it is to be found in higher quality Cambridge editions and the Oxford World's Classics edition.

at least 80% of the text is unaltered from Tyndale's translation.^[90]

(90) - Daniell, David (2003), *The Bible in English: its history and influence*, New Haven, Conn: [Yale University Press](#), [ISBN 0300099304](#)

Standard text of 1769

By the mid-18th Century the wide variation in the various modernized printed texts of the *Authorized Version*, combined with the notorious accumulation of misprints, had reached the proportion of a scandal, and the Universities of [Oxford](#) and [Cambridge](#) both sought to produce an updated standard text. First of the two was the Cambridge edition of 1762 (Herbert #1142), edited by F.S. Parris.^[100] This was effectively superseded by the 1769 Oxford edition, edited by Benjamin Blayney (Herbert #1196), which became the Oxford standard text, and is reproduced almost unchanged in most current printings.^[101] Parris and Blayney sought consistently to remove those elements of the 1611 and subsequent editions that they believed were due to the vagaries of printers, while incorporating most of the revised readings of the Cambridge editions of 1629 and 1638, and each also introducing a few improved readings of their own. They undertook the mammoth task of standardizing the wide variation in punctuation and spelling of the original, making many thousands of minor changes to the text; although some of these updates do alter the ostensible sense - as when the original text of Genesis 2:21 "in stead" ("in that place") was updated to read "instead" ("as an alternative"). In addition, Blayney and Parris thoroughly revised and greatly extended the italicization of "supplied" words not found in the original languages by cross-checking against the presumed source texts. Unfortunately, Blayney assumed that the translators of the 1611 New Testament had worked from the 1550 Stephanus edition of the [Textus Receptus](#), rather than from the later editions of Beza; accordingly the current standard text mistakenly "corrects" around a dozen readings where Beza and Stephanus differ.^[102] Like the 1611 edition, the 1769 Oxford edition included the Apocrypha, although Blayney consistently removed marginal cross-references to the Books of the Apocrypha wherever these had been provided by the original translators. Altogether, Blayney's 1769 text differed from the 1611 text in around 24,000 places.^[103] Since that date, only six further changes have been introduced to the standard text - although 30 of Blayney's proposed changes have subsequently been reverted.^[104] The [Oxford University Press](#) paperback edition of the "*Authorized King James Version*" provides the current standard text, and also includes the prefatory section "The Translators to the Reader".^[105]

From 1769, the text of the *Authorized Version* remained unchanged - and since, due to advances in printing technology, it could now be produced in very large editions for mass sale, it established complete dominance in public and ecclesiastical use in the English-speaking Protestant world.

15 RULES OF TRANSLATION

Fifteen general rules were advanced for the guidance of the translators:

1. The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the Truth of the original will permit.
2. The names of the Prophets, and the Holy Writers, with the other Names of the Text, to be retained, as nigh as may be, accordingly as they were vulgarly used.
3. The Old Ecclesiastical Words to be kept, viz. the Word Church not to be translated Congregation &c.
4. When a Word hath divers Significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most of the Ancient Fathers, being agreeable to the Propriety of the Place, and the Analogy of the Faith.
5. The Division of the Chapters to be altered, either not at all, or as little as may be, if Necessity so require.
6. No Marginal Notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek Words, which cannot without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed in the Text.
7. Such Quotations of Places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit Reference of one Scripture to another.
8. Every particular Man of each Company, to take the same Chapter or Chapters, and having translated or amended them severally by himself, where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree for their Parts what shall stand.
9. As any one Company hath dispatched any one Book in this Manner they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously, for His Majesty is very careful in this Point.
10. If any Company, upon the Review of the Book so sent, doubt or differ upon any Place, to send them Word thereof; note the Place, and withal send the Reasons, to which if they consent not, the Difference to be compounded at the general Meeting, which is to be of the chief Persons of each Company, at the end of the Work.

11. When any Place of special Obscurity is doubted of, Letters to be directed by Authority, to send to any Learned Man in the Land, for his Judgement of such a Place.

12. Letters to be sent from every Bishop to the rest of his Clergy, admonishing them of this Translation in hand; and to move and charge as many skilful in the Tongues; and having taken pains in that kind, to send his particular Observations to the Company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford.

13. The Directors in each Company, to be the Deans of Westminster, and Chester for that Place; and the King's Professors in the Hebrew or Greek in either University.

14. These translations to be used when they agree better with the Text than the Bishops Bible: Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's, Geneva.

15. Besides the said Directors before mentioned, three or four of the most Ancient and Grave Divines, in either of the Universities, not employed in Translating, to be assigned by the vice-Chancellor, upon Conference with the rest of the Heads, to be Overseers of the Translations as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the 4th Rule above specified.

The KJV translators generally followed the grammatical elements and word order of the Bishops' Bible.

The KJV is supported by far more evidence. Of over 5,300 pieces of manuscript evidence, ninety-five percent supports the King James Bible! The changes in the new versions are based on the remaining five percent of manuscripts, most of which are from Alexandria, Egypt. (There are only two lines of Bibles: *the Devil's line from Alexandria*, and *the Lord's line from Antioch*. We'll deal with this later.)

The KJV exalts the Lord Jesus Christ. The true scriptures should testify of Jesus Christ (John 5:39). There is no book on this planet which exalts Christ higher than the King James Bible. In numerous places the new perversions attack the Deity of Christ, the Blood Atonement, the Resurrection, salvation by grace through faith, and

the Second Coming. The true scriptures will *TESTIFY* of Jesus Christ, not *ATTACK* Him!

We hear much talk these days about "older" and "more authoritative" manuscripts, but we aren't hearing much about the *origin* of these manuscripts. It is a well established fact that there are only two lines of Bibles: one coming from Antioch, Syria (known as the Syrian or Byzantine type text), and one coming from Alexandria, Egypt (known as the Egyptian or Hesycnian type text). The Syrian text from Antioch is the Majority text from which our King James 1611 comes, and the Egyptian text is the minority text from which the new perversions come. (Never mind Rome and her *Western* text, for she got her manuscripts from Alexandria.)

The manuscripts from Antioch were mostly copied by Bible-believing Christians for the purpose of winning souls and spreading the word of God. The manuscripts from Alexandria were produced by infidels such as Origen Adamantius and Clement of Alexandria. These manuscripts are corrupted with Greek philosophy (Col. 2:8), and allegorical foolishness (not believing God's word literally). The strange thing is that most Christians aren't paying any attention to what God's word says about these two places! Notice how the Holy Spirit casts Egypt and Alexandria in a *NEGATIVE* light, while His comments on Antioch tend to be very positive:

ALEXANDRIA

Alexandria was the second largest city of the Roman Empire, with Rome being the first. It was founded in 332 B.C. by Alexander the Great (a type of the Antichrist in Daniel 8). Located at the Nile Delta, Alexandria was the home of the Pharos Lighthouse, one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient world. Also, during the second and third centuries B.C., it was the home of a massive library containing between 500,000 and 700,000 volumes. It was also the home of a catechetical school once headmastered by the great apostate Adamantius Origen (185-254 A.D.).

ANTIOCH

Founded in 300 B.C. by Seleucus Nicator, Antioch was the third largest city of the Roman Empire. Located in Syria, about twenty miles inland from the Mediterranean on the Orontes River, Antioch had it's on sea port and more than it's share of travelers and tradesmen. In His infinite wisdom, God picked the ideal location for a "home base". Antioch was far enough away from the culture and traditions of the Jews (Jerusalem and Judaea) and the Gentiles (Rome, Greece, Alexandria, etc) that new Christians could grow in the Lord. Meanwhile, it's geographical location was ideal for taking God's word into all the world.

So, friend, you have a choice. You can get your Bible from Alexandria, or you can get it from Antioch. If you have a KJV, then your Bible is based on manuscripts from Antioch. If you have a new version, then you are one of many unfortunate victims of Satan's salesmen from Alexandria, Egypt.

When someone "corrects" the King James Bible with "more authoritative manuscripts" or "older manuscripts," or "the best authorities," they're usually making some reference to Sinaiticus or Vaticanus. These are two very corrupt fourth century uncials that are practically worshipped by modern scholars. These are the primary manuscripts that Westcott and Hort relied so heavily on when constructing their Greek text (1851-1871) on which the new versions are based.

Vaticanus (B) is the most worshipped. This manuscript was officially catalogued in the Vatican library in 1475, and is still property of the Vatican today. Sinaiticus (Aleph) was discovered in a trash can at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai by Count Tischendorf, a German scholar, in the year 1844. Both B and Aleph are Roman Catholic manuscripts. Remember that! You might also familiarize yourself with the following facts:

Vaticanus was available to the King James translators, but God gave them sense enough to ignore it.

Vaticanus and Sinaiticus not only disagree with the Majority Text from which the KJV came, they also differ from each other. In the four Gospels alone, they differ over 3,000 times!

Vaticanus omits the entire book of Revelation, while keeping the Apocrypha!

Translating the King James Bible

Unlike Westcott, Hort, and the R.V. Committee, King James went through great efforts to guard the 1611 translation from errors. Please note the following:

1. In 1604, King James announced that fifty-four Hebrew and Greek scholars had been appointed to translate a new Bible for English speaking people. The number was reduced to forty-seven by the time the work formally began in 1607.
2. Rather than working together all at one location, these men were divided into six separate groups, which worked at three separate locations. There were two at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge.

3. Each group was given a selected portion of Scripture to translate.
4. Each scholar made his own translation of a book, and then passed it on to be reviewed by each member of his group.
5. The whole group then went over the book together.
6. Once a group had completed a book of the Bible, they sent it to be reviewed by the other five groups.
7. All objectionable and questionable translating was marked and noted, and then it was returned to the original group for consideration.
8. A special committee was formed by selecting one leader from each group. This committee worked out all of the remaining differences and presented a finished copy for the printers in 1611.
9. This means that the King James Bible had to pass at least *FOURTEEN* examinations before going to press.
10. Throughout this entire process, any learned individuals of the land could be called upon for their judgment, and the churches were kept informed of the progress.

QUESTION: Does THIS sound like an HONEST work of God or a DISHONEST work of the Devil?

The Various Editions of the 1611 A.V.

1. If someone decides to produce a "new Bible version", then they must also convince Christians that there is a NEED and a justifiable CAUSE for the new version. One of the deceitful excuses being used today for producing new versions is that *the King James Bible has been revised several times since 1611, and that a new revision is needed once again*. While spreading this piece of deceitful misinformation, the KJV critics hold their breath, hoping that no one will be intelligent enough to ask for specific details about these "revisions". The many revisions that have occurred since 1881 bear NO RESEMBLANCE to the various EDITIONS of the KJV prior to 1881. The modern revisors are just trying to justify their sins!
2. There were only FOUR actual EDITIONS of the King James Bible produced after 1611: *1629, 1638, 1762, and 1769*. These were not translations (like the new versions SINCE 1881), and they really weren't even "revisions".
3. The 1629 edition was simply an effort to correct *printing errors*, and two of the original King James translators assisted in the work.
4. The 1638 edition of the KJV also dealt with printing errors, especially

words and clauses overlooked by the printers. About 72% of the textual corrections in the KJV were done by 1638, only 27 years after the first printing.

5. Please bear in mind the fact that printing was a very laborious task prior to 1800. Publishing a flawless work was almost impossible. Even today, with computers and advanced word processors, printing errors are still frequently made. Imagine what it was like in the 1600's!
6. Then, in 1762 and 1769, two final editions of the KJV were published. Both of these involved *spelling changes*, which became necessary as the English language became more stabilized and spelling rules were established.
7. There were no new *translations*, and there were really no new *revisions* published in 1629, 1638, 1762, or 1769. These were simply EDITIONS of the 1611 KJV, which corrected printing errors and spelling. Those who try to equate these editions with the modern translations are just being deceitful or stupid--*or both*. The many other so-called "revisions" of the KJV that occurred in 1613, 1616, 1617, and 1743 are nothing more than running changes and touch-up work at the printers. The REAL revisions and translations do not start appearing until 1881 (RV) and 1901 (ASV). So if some punk walks up with a smirky grin on his face and asks you, "So which King James Bible do you have, the 1611, the 1629, the 1638, the 1762, or the 1769?", you can simply state that you have a *1769 edition of the King James 1611 Authorized Version*.